PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 1E Integrated Regional Water Management (IRWM) Grant Program

Stormwater Flood Management Grant, Round 1, 2010-2011

Applicant Contra Costa Water District

Amount Requested $10,000,000

Proposal Title Contra Costa Water District Stormwater Flood Management Proposal

Total Proposal Cost $20,000,000

PROPOSAL SUMMARY

The Project is Phase 5 of a larger project with 5 different phases. Phase 5 would install a) 4,000 feet of pipeline to replace unlined canal and levees and b) a flood isolation structure to prevent breach or inflow of poor quality water in case of a Delta levee failure. Phase 2, 3, and 4 have yet to be built. The full, five-phased Project will replace 21,000 feet of the unlined Contra Costa Canal (the Canal) with a pipeline to improve source water quality available to the CCWD by preventing intrusion of poor quality groundwater.

PROPOSAL SCORE

Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible	Criteria	Score/ Max. Possible
Work Plan	**12/15**	Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction and Water Supply Benefits	**6/12**
Budget	**2/5**	Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits	**6/12**
Schedule	**5/5**	Program Preferences	**8/10**
Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures	**4/5**		
		Total Score (max. possible = 64)	**43**

EVALUATION SUMMARY

Work Plan

The criterion is fully addressed but not supported by thorough documentation. The tasks lack adequate level of detail to ensure the implementation of the project and serve as a scope of work in an agreement (per page 28 of the PSP). While the format is concise, more narrative would communicate to the reviewers that the project is well thought out and the Work Plan could serve as agreement scope. Although the Project is Phase 5 of a larger project, the implementation of the tasks described will yield benefits, and the Schedules of project phases are not interdependent. Phase 1 was completed in 2009; however, it is not clear when Phases 2, 3, and 4 will begin and be completed.

Note: Phase 2 was included in the East Contra Costa County IRWM Region's Prop 84, Implementation application. The timing of Phases 2, 3, and 4 completion is of concern to DWR's Dutch Slough Tidal Marsh Restoration Project.

Budget

The Budgets for less than half the tasks in the Proposal have detailed cost information as described in Attachment 4; many of the costs cannot be verified as reasonable, and supporting documentation is lacking. For example, none of the tasks include an estimate of hours or billing rate. Task 4 – Construction/Implementation Tasks has a detailed breakdown of costs but does not provide supporting information to determine how the unit costs were estimated. Task 2- Land Purchase/Easement is based on the costs of Phase 1, which is several miles away and completed in 2009. The remaining tasks estimates are based on previous efforts or a percentage of construction costs. Finally, the construction contingency, 25%, seems excessive for a project of this complexity.

Note: Reviewers noted marked differences between costs presented in Phase 2 in the Prop 84 Implementation grant application and costs presented for Phase 5 in this application.

Schedule

The Schedule is consistent and reasonable, with the Notice to Proceed date within six months (March 15, 2012) after the anticipated award date (October 1, 2011).

Monitoring, Assessment, and Performance Measures

The criterion is fully addressed but not supported by thorough documentation or sufficient rationale. Although the output and outcome indicators for a project such as this are basic, they could be better developed. Unsupported reduction in salinity (electrical conductivity) claims are made in 3 of the 6 outcome indicators, yet field sampling to confirm such is not proposed. Also, the outcome indicator and target for Goal 1 should not be exclusively linked to seismic events. According to the Work Plan, existing flood risks have been linked to overtopping, unrelated to a seismic event.

Economic Analysis – Flood Damage Reduction (FDR) and Water Supply Benefits

Average levels of FDR and water supply benefits can be realized through this proposal, however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking or supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. Seismic benefits are the largest category of quantified benefits, but are based on assumptions that are not well justified. Probability of a seismic event that is developed for the Delta as a whole is assumed to apply to the project site. Both of the major water supply benefits use unit values for water that are overestimated.

Economic Analysis – Water Quality and Other Expected Benefits

Average levels of water quality and other benefits can be realized through this proposal, however, the quality of the analysis is partially lacking and supporting documentation is partially unsubstantiated. Water quality benefits are described as the value of avoided health risks, but some assumptions are not well justified. Other categories of benefits, including avoided drownings and the value of habitat, probably attribute too much change as a result of the project.

Program Preferences

The proposal demonstrates with a significant degree of certainty that a number of Program Preferences can be achieved by implementing the proposed project. Thorough documentation with breadth and magnitude is provided for the following Program Preferences: Include Regional Projects or Programs; Effectively

Integrate Water Management Programs and Projects within hydrologic region identified in the CWP, RWQCB region or subdivision; or other region or sub-region specifically identified by DWR; Contribute to Attainment of One or More of the Objectives of the CALFED Bay-Delta Program; Drought Preparedness; Use and Reuse Water More Efficiently, Practice Integrated Flood Management, and Protect Surface Water and Ground Quality.